

Minutes
Transit Development Plan Advisory Committee
June 29, 2006

Attendees: Committee Members - Nye Bond, Beatty Brasch, Rod Griess, Kim Phelps, Joy Patten, Jill Flagel, Randy Hoskins
Core Staff - Larry Worth, Brian Praeuner, David Cary
Consultant - David Sampson, Urbitran

Absent: Committee Members - Susan Epps, Jennifer Dam, Kevin Johnson, Patte Newman, Jane Stricker, Dallas McGee
Core Staff - Kent Morgan

The meeting started at 8:27 a.m.

Brian Praeuner opened the meeting with a distribution of the Transit User Survey Summary and minutes from the previous meeting on April 6, 2006. The April 6, 2006 minutes were approved as submitted.

David Cary thanked the committee for their participation and noted he, Larry Worth and Brian Praeuner are available for any questions/discussion anytime during the process of this project.

David turned the meeting over to Urbitran Consultant, David Sampson who summarized the Progress Report (attached). Mr. Sampson noted the Project is somewhat ahead of schedule with Phase 2 – Public Outreach and Meetings being completed. Phase 3 – Comprehensive Operations Analysis consisting of Technical Memorandums (TM) 1-4 were reviewed by Mr. Sampson as follows:

- Maps were presented showing current transit services along with trip generators indicating transit potential scores.
- Current transit services were described for baseline review, including trends in ridership, revenues, costs, detailed ridership data by route, time of day, etc. Collection of data.
- Peer group and trend analysis was done with nine cities comparable to Lincoln compiling averages for service area population, peak vehicles, revenue hours, revenue miles, ridership, annual operating costs, passenger revenues, service area square miles, population density, and University population. StarTran was noted to be above the peer average on financial efficiency, with service effectiveness lower than peer averages. StarTran's farebox recovery is higher than the peers, however the level of service is lower. Although StarTran compares favorably with peers, the main focus of the peer analysis is to serve as an identification of issues, pro and con, and not indicate solutions. In response to a question, Mr. Sampson noted peer analysis information is 2004, as it is drawn from the latest, 2004, NTD survey results.
- Public outreach collection has been completed and the findings are summarized in Technical Memorandum #4. It appears that most people interviewed believe transit services are an important part of the community and would like for it to be operated as efficiently as possible. Ridership consists of not only transit-dependent population, as many are "choice" riders, utilizing StarTran because of gas prices, parking costs, environmental reasons, convenience, etc. Changes suggested included realignment of routes, shorter headways, and evening service. Alternative management and organizational options were also suggested to provide for a more reliable funding base.

- The next step will be to develop a set of standards to review the entire system to make alternative recommendations.

David Cary explained the process of the Transit User Survey which was provided to all patrons, on all routes, on one particular day. The 49% response rate gave a good representation of the average transit user. 38% had a car available, to use, but chose transit. 16% were in the income level above \$40,000 which confirms that not only the low-income population utilize transit services.

In response to a question, Mr. Sampson indicated that since in the peer analysis the National Transit Data is from 2004, there will be an adjustment made to reflect current data in final analysis.

David Cary reminded that the next committee meeting will be in September with a date to be determined later.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:17 a.m.